



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 9400
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/726,004

12/01/2003

Gerd Danner

34874-082 UTIL

5231

64280

7590

11/21/2006

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 600
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,004

Applicant(s)

DANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Y. Chen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/28/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on Aug. 28, 2006.

Claims 1-20, are pending for examination, claims 1-4, 7, 9 and 15 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under Section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in Section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subSection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0208460 issued to Srikant et al. (hereinafter referred as Srikant).

Claim 1:

Srikant discloses a system for operational reporting of multidimensional analysis of business data sources [e.g., the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at

Art Unit: 2161

P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, the Distributed Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the system comprising:

one or more data sources providing OLTP data [e.g., the data warehouse at Section 0004, the source metadata and the OLAP data store at P. 1, Sections: 0009, the Distributed Teradata Warehouse, 0034-0035, the units: 420, 434 at Fig. 4 and associated texts];

a business intelligence (BI) platform having a multidimensional database providing OLAP data [e.g., P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052 & Fig. 4]; and

a unified view module integrate the OLTP data with the multidimensional database to produce a common meta model data set [e.g., Fig. 8 and associated texts]; and

a user interface (UI) tool set for creating a unified UI for displaying reports that are run on the multidimensional database and common meta model data set [e.g., the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 2:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the system comprising a UI runtime module to display the unified UI [e.g., P. 3, Sections: 0035-0036].

Claim 3:

Art Unit: 2161

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the system comprising a data acquisition module to acquire the OLTP data from the OLTP data source, and to provide the OLTP data to the multidimensional database or to the unified view module [e.g., P.3, Sections: 0031, 0036-37].

Claim 4:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the BI platform is to execute OLAP analysis on the multidimensional database [e.g., P. 2, Section: 0015-0016 & Fig. 7].

Claim 5:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, Srikant further discloses the BI platform further includes a communication channel connected to a remote OLAP data source [e.g., the Internet at P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 6:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, Srikant further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more resource adapters for connecting to the one or more data sources [e.g., Fig. 7 & P. 6, Sections: 0062-0064].

Claim 7:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, Srikant further discloses the data acquisition module further includes one or more extraction programs to read data from the one or more data sources [e.g., the extract/link/load software of OLAP at P. 1, Section: 0005 & Fig. 8].

Claim 8:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 3, Srikant further discloses the data acquisition module further includes an exchange infrastructure for message-based exchange between the one or more data sources and the BI platform [e.g., the Teradata Customer Analysis Product at P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 9:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the system comprising a mapping tool for mapping a data model of the one or more data sources to a common meta model for use by the unified view module [e.g., P. 5, Section: 0059].

Claim 10:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 9, Srikant further discloses the mapping is automatic [e.g., P. 2, Section: 0012].

Claim 11:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 9, Srikant further discloses the mapping is manual [e.g., P. 6, Section: 0071].

Claim 12:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, Srikant further discloses the BI platform further comprises a persistency memory for storing one or more tables representing the OLAP analysis [e.g., the unit 312, Fig. 3].

Claim 13:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the unified UI is generated by a web application [e.g., the Web GUI at P.3, Section: 0035 & P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 14:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 1, Srikant further discloses the unified UI is generated by a desktop application [e.g., the Web GUI at P. 6, Section: 0064].

Claim 15:

Srikant discloses an architecture for integrating online transactional processing (OLTP) systems with online analytical processing (OLAP) system [e.g., the Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) application at P. 1, Sections: 0003-0010, Distributed

Teradata Warehouse & Teradata Customer Analysis product at section 0035], the architecture comprising:

- a data access layer including one or more data access programs for accessing OLTP data [e.g., Fig. 3];

- a service layer including a business intelligence (BI) platform for generating OLAP data [e.g., P. 1, Sections: 0003-0005, 0050-0052 & Fig. 4];

- a unified view module providing a common meta-model for OLTP data integrated with OLAP data [e.g., Fig. 8 and associated texts]; and

- a user interface presentation layer configured to provide a user interface for displaying a report run on the integrated OLTP and OLAP data [e.g., the Graphical User Interface (GUI) at P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 16:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 15, Srikant further discloses the common meta-model is organized into a unified business query view for display in the user interface [e.g., Fig. 2].

Claim 17:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 15, Srikant further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a design time module for generating the user interface [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0031].

Claim 18:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 17, Srikant further discloses the user interface presentation layer includes a runtime module having an application for displaying the user interface [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 19:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 18, Srikant further discloses the application is a web application [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0035].

Claim 20:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 18, Srikant further discloses the application is a desktop application [e.g., P. 3, Section: 0035].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 28, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments and piecemeal interpretation against 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection. Applicant's arguments are summarized as following:

- 1) Srikant does not disclose integration of OLTP data with multidimensional database or OLAP data.
- 2) Srikant does not disclose generating a common meta model data set.

Art Unit: 2161

In reply to arguments 1), the examiner directs applicant's attention to the following excerpts cited by Srikant:

"To facilitate improved BI solutions, organizations have developed data warehouses, which organize and link important customer information from a variety of data stores in a centrally accessible data repository. The data warehouses can include information gathered from various online transaction processing (OLTP) applications that record transactions and or behaviors of customers when the customers interact with the organizations in some way. Various data mining, Word Wide Web (WWW) mining, and Decision Support System (DSS) applications can be used against the data warehouse of an organization to create desired BI solutions." (Section: 0004)

Here, Srikant clearly discloses using data warehouses to gather (or integrate) data from various OLTP applications.

Furthermore, he clearly discloses a distributed "Teradata warehouse" which is a data store for various BI solutions" as following:

"Furthermore and in more embodiments of the present invention, the various tools of the present disclosure are implemented as a GUI interfaces using WWW pages within a WWW browser. Moreover, the data store is a Teradata warehouse, distributed by NCR Corporation of Dayton, Ohio. Furthermore, various BI solutions can be developed with the present invention and embodied within a Teradata Customer Analysis product, distributed by NCR Corporation of Dayton, Ohio. Of course it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that any interface, data store, or BI solutions can be used with the tenets of the present invention, and all such implementation decisions are intended to fall within the scope of the present disclosure." (Section: 0035)

Therefore, In contrary to applicant's arguments, Srikant clearly discloses the features in arguments 1).

In reply to arguments 2), the examiner further points out that Srikant clearly disclose the claimed limitations. For example, Srikant discloses a report linking system as shown by Fig. 8 that includes a Linking Set (LS) module (e.g., 830, Fig. 8 and associated texts) to link generated report metadata (e.g., 840, Fig. 8) into a common report-processing set of executable instructions (e.g., 850, Fig. 8, Section: 0056) which is a common OLAP model tool coupled with multidimensional database (e.g., 820, Fig. 8) and the generated metadata in an OLAP compatible format (e.g., Section:0069).

Therefore, based on the discussion above, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2161

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

November 16, 2006


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100